

REVIEWS

worries about epistemological problems. Indeed, these are made obvious to him by the attempt to deal with actual problems of semantic analysis.

All in all, this is a very interesting book for those who are interested in the problems of language, thinking, and meaning. While this book is, in many senses, non-systematic and rambling, it is a serious attempt to deal with the analysis of meaning in all the nooks and crannies which embed our mentation processes to try to understand how we talk (and think) specifically about ourselves and others. It is the application of what theories there are, and the attempt to invent or apply others where there are gaps discovered.

Theories of personality aside, a careful reading of the author's delights and dilemmas, helps to pinpoint many issues in the problem of meaning which might remain inobvious to an academic approach which eschews application. The fact is that there are practitioners of many medical and para-medical arts who (believe they) have and use detailed semantic theories. They are not lacking in the world. Each of us, as Bromley has said well, also embodies such theories. Their analysis can teach us a great deal.

The author points out where the problems are the ways to think about them. But, finally, he does not take us into the experience of being a person. We remain outsiders in our own existence, as we enter a set of circles posited in the name of 'objectivity', toward a more 'useful' set of terms to characterize 'personalities'.

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W. & H. S. Odbert. (1936). Trait names: A psycholexical study. *Psychological Monographs* 41:1-211.

Klages, L. (1929, trs. 1932), *The science of character*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Reviewed by HARVEY SARLES
Department of Anthropology
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

(Received 17 January 1979)

ALVINO E. FANTINI, *Language acquisition of a bilingual child: A sociolinguistic perspective*. Brattleboro, Vermont: The Experiment Press, 1976. Pp. xi + 308.

The paucity of longitudinal studies dealing with developmental bilingualism, particularly from a sociolinguistic perspective, makes Fantini's work a welcome contribution to the literature. The book appears to be Fantini's doctoral dissertation, in its original format, from the University of Texas at Austin. It is a carefully documented diary account of the Spanish/English bilingual development of the author's son, Mario, through age 5. Mario was addressed only in Spanish by his parents and experienced minimal exposure to English until entering nursery school at age 2;1. The child began producing

Spanish words at age 1;4 but, due to delayed exposure, his first productive English was recorded from age 2;6. In his analysis of the child's development as a bilingual, Fantini addresses such questions as when and how the process of language differentiation took place and traces the child's growing awareness of his own bilingualism. After the onset of English production, language mixing was observed during a brief period of two months. Essential separation of the two languages was reportedly complete by age 2;8.

In examining social factors which aided Mario in the differentiation process and continued to influence his language choice thereafter, the author notes the primary factor to be the interlocutor, which reflects the child's clear-cut one person—one language exposure. The second major factor is reported to be the setting of the speech event, which reflects the separation by place – the home language and that of the world outside. Only after language differentiation was essentially complete did the form and the function of a speech event appear to affect language selection.

In the section devoted to the topic of language socialization, the author discusses such caretaker instruction as when to talk, when not to talk, volume regulation, and appropriate content control. In an analysis of Mario's acquisition of speech styles, the author gives examples which he feels illustrate Mario's early ability to discern various styles by their distinctive linguistic features such as pitch, intonation, and morphological devices. Speech samples from roleplay and other situations are cited as examples of the child's awareness of styles even before they made an appearance in his own speech. Various styles such as nonsense sounds, whining, peer talk, courtesy terms, baby talk, and narrative style, together with their communicative functions, are amply illustrated and discussed.

The chapter concerning the child's linguistic profile provides information regarding Mario's early phonological and lexical growth in both languages and his morphological and syntactic development primarily in Spanish. Unfortunately, Fantini did not measure the child's developing proficiency in terms of mean utterance length, of MLU (Brown 1973), which would have provided a reference point and facilitated comparison with other acquisition studies in the literature. Linguistic interference, reported on the levels of phonology, lexicon, and grammar, was generally found to be minimal. Fantini attributes this minimal interference in part to such sociolinguistic factors as the language separation by person and place and the caretakers' insistence on not mixing languages.

Language proficiency tests administered to Mario at various times showed him to be on about the same developmental level as the average monolingual child of the same age. Thus the child evidently experienced no developmental disadvantage due to his early exposure to two languages.

In general, the observations from this study of social factors influencing early bilingual language development show considerable insight and are well

REVIEWS

illustrated with spontaneous speech examples. In view of the delayed onset of the second language in Mario's case, care should be taken in generalizing the findings to cases of children exposed to two languages simultaneously from birth. This may be particularly true with regard to the speed and ease with which Mario learned to differentiate the languages. Overall, this work presents a convincing case for the necessity of exploring the sociolinguistic parameters of language acquisition in order to gain a more accurate picture of developmental processes.

REFERENCE

Brown, R. (1973). *A first language: The early stages*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

(Received 16 April 1979)

Reviewed by WENDY E. REDLINGER
University of Bern, Switzerland

B. McLAUGHLIN, *Second language acquisition in childhood*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1978. Pp. 239.

Can young children learn a second language more easily and more quickly than adults? Do they "do it" in the same way as adults? Are there "critical periods" during when second languages are easiest to learn, and after which such learning is difficult or perhaps impossible? In what ways is second language learning like first language acquisition? What is bilingualism, and how does it relate to simultaneous and successive second language acquisition? Is bilingualism "good" for school-age children (cognitively, socially, academically)? Questions such as these have become increasingly important topics to those interested in a wide range of language-related phenomena. Some evidence of this interest may be seen in the tremendous recent proliferation of volumes on second language acquisition and bilingualism, such as: Simoes' *The bilingual child* (N.Y.: Academic Press, 1976); Hornby's *Bilingualism: Psychological, social and educational implications* (N.Y.: Academic Press, 1977); McKay & Andersson's *Bilingualism in early childhood* (Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House, 1977); Ritchie's *Second language acquisition research: Issues and implications* (N.Y.: Academic Press, 1978); and Albert & Obler's *The bilingual brain: Neuropsychological and neurolinguistic aspects of bilingualism* (N.Y.: Academic Press, 1978). Most of these and other related volumes are collections of individual studies that give a "state of the art" review of differing perspectives on the same general theme of bilingualism. However, none of these provides an integrated approach to the field in which the general and important questions posed earlier are addressed.

The volume by McLaughlin is successful precisely because it *does* focus on the problems that are usually beyond the scope of a single contributed